

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.       | 1    | FILING DATE           | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/072,639            |      | 02/08/2002            | Kyoungsik Yu         | S00-224                 | 3278             |  |
| 30869                 | 7590 | 03/19/2004            |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
|                       |      | CTUAL PROPERT         | STAHL, MICHAEL J     |                         |                  |  |
| 2345 YALE<br>PALO ALT |      | T, 2ND FLOOR<br>94306 |                      | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER   |                  |  |
|                       | -, · |                       |                      | 2874                    |                  |  |
|                       |      |                       |                      | DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | 10/072,639  | YU ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mike Stahl  | 2874   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti<br>ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da<br>will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from<br>e, cause the application to become ABANDONE   | mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This  | s action is non-final.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under I  | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>25-78</u> is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,13,16,17,23 and 24</u> is/are rejecte</li> <li>7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-12,14,15 and 18-22</u> is/are objected</li> </ul>  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) <u>25-78</u> is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1,2,13,16,17,23 and 24</u> is/are rejected.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2002 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.  | re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected or b)□ objec | ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list   | ts have been received.<br>ts have been received in Applicat<br>prity documents have been receiv<br>tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   | ion No<br>ed in this National Stage  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/8/2002</u>.</li> </ul>   |   | Patent Application (PTO-152)   |  |  |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 2874

### Information Disclosure Statement

The references submitted February 8, 2002 have been considered. An initialed copy of form PTO-1449 is attached.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 13, 16-17, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Madsen et al. (article in Photonics Technology Letters, vol. 12 no. 6, June 2000).

Claim 1: Madsen discloses an optical device (fig. 1) comprising: a partially reflecting reflector (the multi-layer stack on the bottom of the silicon substrate, which has a reflectivity of at least about 97 %); a movable mirror (the silicon nitride membrane) spaced apart from the reflector which is movable to vary the spacing between itself and the reflector; and a light collimator for projecting a light beam between the mirror and the reflector at an oblique angle (see the description of the single-stage filter package, first full paragraph in the right column of p. 651).

Art Unit: 2874

Claim 13: In an exemplary embodiment the free spectral range is 100 GHz. At a central wavelength of 1550 nm, the equivalent free spectral range in terms of wavelength is 0.8 nm, which is within the recited range.

Claim 16: The nominal spacing between the mirror and the reflector is  $\frac{3}{4}\lambda$ , which for  $\lambda=1550$  nm works out to 1162.5 nm.

Claim 17: The reflector has a uniform reflectivity.

Claim 23: The reflector and the movable mirror are planar parallel when the movable mirror (the silicon nitride membrane) is in the undeflected state.

Claim 24: The reflector and the movable mirror are not entirely parallel when the movable mirror membrane is in the deflected state.

Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paiam (US 6252716).

Claim 1: Paiam discloses an optical device (fig. 3) including: a partially reflecting, partially transparent reflector (the back mirror of either Gires-Tournois cavity 22/24, which has a reflectivity of 99.9 % in the fig. 1 example); a movable mirror (the front facet of the cavity) spaced apart from the reflector and movable to vary the spacing between itself and the reflector (see claims 1-3 and the description associated with the tunable modification of figs. 11 and 12); and a collimator 30 which projects a light beam at an oblique angle between the mirror and the reflector.

Claim 23: The reflector and the movable mirror are planar parallel.

Art Unit: 2874

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madsen et al. (cited above).

Claim 2: Madsen mentions an incidence angle of about 0.6 degrees, which is slightly outside the claimed range. However, it would have been obvious to a skilled person to design a given package with any small incidence angle which satisfies the stated goals of minimizing the walkoff and the polarization dependent loss. The incidence angle would depend on the particular implementation of the package, so it is conceivable that some package embodiments would require an incidence angle of about 1 degree or more.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2874

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-12, 14-15, and 18-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 25-78 are allowed.

As to claims 3, 10, and 55, neither applied reference teaches or suggests an array of separately movable micromirrors. Each reference uses only a single movable mirror, and only one reflection from that mirror. There is no apparent need to have an array of mirrors. Claims 4-8, 11-12, and 56-78 are depend from claims 3, 10, and 55 respectively.

As to claim 14, neither reference discloses or suggests specifically setting the free spectral range of the device to an integer multiple of the beam bandwidth.

As to claim 15, as noted above the light beam reflects from the mirror only once, not multiple times in different positions on the mirror as claimed.

As to claim 18, neither reference teaches or suggests providing the reflector with a nonuniform reflectivity. Claim 19 depends from claim 18.

As to claim 20, neither reference teaches or suggests including a spatial light modulator on the side of the reflector opposite the mirror side.

As to claim 21, neither reference discloses or suggests a convex area on the movable mirror for focusing the light beam. There does not appear to be any need for additional focusing in the disclosed devices.

As to claim 22, the applied references fail to disclose or suggest having the reflector include a light valve having a variable reflectivity.

Art Unit: 2874

As to claim 25, the applied references do not teach or suggest producing a plurality of

spaced apart emergent beams by transmission of the light beam through the reflector. The device

in each reference is set up to receive a single reflected beam at one location. There is no

provision for dealing with multiple spaced apart emergent beams. Claims 26-54 are allowable at

least by dependence from claim 25.

Conclusion

The following references are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and are cited

on the attached PTO-892 form: US 2003/0035216, US 2003/0021525, US 5071225, US

6292298.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mike Stahl at (571)

272-2360. Official communications which are eligible for submission by facsimile and which

pertain to this application may be faxed to (703) 872-9306. Inquiries of a general or clerical

nature (e.g., a request for a missing form or paper, etc.) should be directed to the Technology

Center 2800 receptionist at (703) 308-0956 or to the technical support staff supervisor at (703)

308-3072.

RCM

Michael J. Stahl Patent Examiner Art Unit 2874 AKM ENAYET ULLAH PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 2, 2004